



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS PO Hox 1450 Alexandra, Viguna 22313-1450

Alexandria, Vinginia 22313-1456
www uspto act

DATE MAILED: 07/30/2003

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO	
09/927,005	08/09/2001	Yohei Nakanishi	1307.65744	4178	
750	90 67 30 2003				
Patrick G. Burns, Esq. GREER, BURNS & CRAIN, LTD. Suite 2500 300 South Wacker Dr.			EXAMINER		
			DUONG, TAI V		
Chicago, IL 60			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
2.,			2871		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)	- th				
		09/927,005	NAKANISHI ET AL.					
Office Action Summary		Examiner	Art Unit					
•		TAI DUONG	2871					
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication ap or Reply	ppears on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence add	ress				
THE - Exter after - If the - If NC - Failu - Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPI MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION nsions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reperiod for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period reto reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statutely received by the Office later than three months after the mailing and patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).		mely filed ys will be considered timely. the mailing date of this com ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	nmunication.				
1)	Responsive to communication(s) filed on	·						
2a)□	,	his action is non-final.						
3)	/							
Disposit	on of Claims							
4)[Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application	on.						
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.							
5)	Claim(s) is/are allowed.							
6)	Claim(s) is/are rejected.							
7)	Claim(s) is/are objected to.							
	Claim(s) <u>1-15</u> are subject to restriction and/or fon Papers	r election requirement.						
9) 🗌	The specification is objected to by the Examin	er.						
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.								
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).								
11) The proposed drawing correction filed on is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.								
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.								
12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.								
Priority (ınder 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120							
13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).								
a)	⊠ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:							
	1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.							
	2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No							
* 5	 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 							
	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domes	·		application).				
a)	rovisional application has been red	ceived.	,				
Attachmen		p						
1) Notic	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	5) Notice of Informal	y (PTO-413) Paper No(s Patent Application (PTO-					
0 B 4 C 4 F	1							

Application/Control Number: 09/927,005

• Art Unit: 2871

Election/Restrictions

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- Claims 1-13, drawn to a liquid crystal (LC) panel, classified in class 349, subclass 141.
- II. Claims 14 and 15, drawn to a LC panel development method, classified in class 345, subclass 87.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions I and II are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case, the method of claims 14 and 15 can be practiced with the LC panel of the Related Art of the instant Figures 31-37, instead of the LC panels having structures as recited in claims 1-13.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art because of their recognized divergent subject matter and by their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Further, Group I contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species of the claimed invention:

A: claims 1 and 2 drawn to a LC panel of Figs. 16-18;

B: claims 3-5 drawn to a LC panel of Figs. 19-26;

Application/Control Number: 09/927,005

· Art Unit: 2871

C: claims 6-13 drawn to a LC panel of Figs. 27-30.

If Group I is elected, Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a <u>single</u> disclosed species of Group I for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, none of the claims is generic.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

Art Unit: 2871

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Tai Duong at telephone number 703 308-4873.

TVD

07/25/03